REMARKS

The Official Action of June 21, 2007, and the references cited therein have been carefully considered. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-22 have been canceled without prejudice and rewritten for presentation as new Claims 23-31 to be directed to the compounds wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4. Support for this amendment is found in the specification, e.g. pages 4-11, and the claims of the application as filed.

1. Claims 23-31 are pending in the application.

2. Applicants acknowledge the Examiners consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement.

3. Under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372, the Examiner previously required restriction among: Group I: Claims 1-20 (in part) drawn to compounds/compositions of formula (I), process of making and methods of use (e.g. treating anxiety, depression or migraine); Group II: Claims 1-17 and 21 (in part) drawn to compounds/compositions of formula (I), process of making and methods of use (e.g. treating schizophrenia); and Group III: Claims 1-17 and 22 (in part) drawn to compounds/compositions of formula (I), process of making and methods of use (e.g. treating epilepsy). Applicants hereby affirm their election of Group I and the title compound of Example 31 made in their reply of May 1, 2007. In the interest of compact prosecution Applicants hereby withdraw their traverse and have accordingly cancelled the non-elected subject matter without prejudice.

4. Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph , for lack of enablement. Although Applicants respectfully assert that the specification fully enables such claim, in the interest of compact prosecution, Claims 15-17 have been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement has been rendered moot.

5.1 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Doebber et al. CAS: 2000:12845 (i.e., US 6,020,382). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Doebber et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O- and m is 0 (zero). Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Doebber et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.2 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Doebber et al. CAS:130:47486. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Doebber et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein X is -O- and Y is -O-. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Doebber et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.3 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Carson et al. CAS: 107:96724. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Carson et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein X is -O- and Y is -O-. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Carson et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.4 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Kuchar et al. CAS: 185890. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Kuchar et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O- and Y is -O-. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuchar et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.5 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Bright et al. CAS: 126:185890. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Bright et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein X is -O- and Y is -O-. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bright et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.6 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Takeda/Nohara et al. CAS: 105:133529. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Takeda/Noharaet al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takeda/Nohara et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.7 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Brown et al. CAS: 110:172814. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Brown et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O- and Y is -O-. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-

17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.8 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Nohara et al. CAS: 126:217632 (i.e., US 4,672,073). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Nohara et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nohara et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.9 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Carson et al. CAS: 107:96440. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Carson et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Carson et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.10 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Steggles et al. CAS: 102:166756. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Steggles et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein X is -O- and Y is -O-. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Steggles et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.11 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Goldsworthy et al. CAS: 102:62239 (i.e., US 4,595,540). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Goldsworthy et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein X is -O- and Y is -O-. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Goldsworthy et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.12 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Oxford et al. CAS: 96:51977. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Oxford et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oxford et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.13 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Schultz et al. CAS: 107:96440. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Schultz et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schultz et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.14 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Adams et al. CAS: 107:96440. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Adams et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-,Y is -O- and m is 0 (zero). Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Adams et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

5.15 Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Belanger et al. CAS: US 4,820,876. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Belanger et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, in particular, wherein W is tetrazolyl. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Belanger et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

6,7. Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Doebber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,382) in view of Wojcik et al. publication, Curr. Opin. Investig. Drug, 2001, 2(8): 1112-9 (i.e. see abstract).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and provide the following comments. The Applicants respectfully assert that Doebber et al. in view of Wojcik does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Nor would Doebber et al. in view of Wojcik have motivated or enabled one skilled in the art to employ the subject compounds in accordance with the claimed invention. Moreover, in view of the state of the art, one skilled in the art would have been discouraged from the compounds of the claimed invention.

Doebber et al. discloses compounds, which have activity for lowering or modulating triglyceride, cholesterol or high density lipoprotein levels, which are useful as e.g. antidiabetic agents. In contrast, the present compounds are potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors, which are useful for treating neurological or psychiatric disorders. Wojcik merely indicates that a mGlu5 (metabotropic glutamate 5) receptor antagonist has activity as an anxiolytic (antianxiety agent) and adds nothing to Doebber et al.

As discussed above, the present claims are directed to compounds wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, which are structurally distinct from the compounds of Doebber et al.

Applicants respectively submit that there would have been no motivation nor guidance for one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the compounds of Doebber et al. in view of Wojcik having activity as antidiabetic agents and then to have modified compounds with respect to W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, to prepare the instant compounds which have activity as potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obviousness over Doebber et al. in view of Wojick is untenable and should be withdrawn.

8. Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Adams et al. WO 97/28115 in view of Wojcik et al. publication, Curr. Opin. Investig. Drug, 2001, 2(8): 1112-9 (i.e. see abstract).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and provide the following comments. The Applicants respectfully assert that Adams et al. in view of Wojcik does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Nor would Adams et al. in view of Wojcik have motivated or enabled one skilled in the art to employ the subject compounds in accordance with the claimed invention. Moreover, in view of the state of the art, one skilled in the art would have been discouraged from the compounds of the claimed invention.

Adams et al. discloses compounds, which have activity for lowering or modulating triglyceride, cholesterol or high density lipoprotein levels, which are useful as e.g. antidiabetic agents. In contrast, the present compounds are potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors, which are useful for treating neurological or psychiatric disorders. Wojcik merely indicates that a mGlu5 (metabotropic glutamate 5) receptor antagonist has activity as an anxiolytic (antianxiety agent) and adds nothing to Adams et al.

As discussed above, the present claims are directed to compounds wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, which are structurally distinct from the compounds of Adams et al.

Applicants respectively submit that there would have been no motivation nor guidance for one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the compounds of Adams et al. in view of Wojcik having activity as antidiabetic agents and then to have modified compounds with respect to W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, to prepare the instant compounds which have activity as potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obviousness over Adams et al. in view of Wojick is untenable and should be withdrawn.

9. Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Goldsworthy et al. US 4,595,540 in view of Wojcik et al. publication, Curr. Opin. Investig. Drug, 2001, 2(8): 1112-9 (i.e. see abstract).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and provide the following comments. The Applicants respectfully assert that Goldsworthy et al. in view of Wojcik does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Nor would Goldsworthy et al. in view of Wojcik have motivated or enabled one skilled in the art to employ the subject compounds in accordance with the claimed invention. Moreover, in view of the state of the art, one skilled in the art would have been discouraged from the compounds of the claimed invention.

Goldsworthy et al. discloses compounds, which have activity as leukotriene antagonists, which are useful as e.g. anti-asmatic agents. In contrast, the present compounds are potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors, which are useful for treating neurological or psychiatric disorders. Wojcik merely indicates that a mGlu5 (metabotropic glutamate 5) receptor antagonist has activity as an anxiolytic (antianxiety agent) and adds nothing to Goldsworthy et al.

As discussed above, the present claims are directed to compounds wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, which are structurally distinct from the compounds of Adams et al.

Applicants respectively submit that there would have been no motivation nor guidance for one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the compounds of Goldsworthy et al. in view of Wojcik having activity as leukotriene antagonists and then to have modified compounds with respect to W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, to prepare the instant compounds which have activity as potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obviousness over Goldsworthy et al. in view of Wojick is untenable and should be withdrawn.

10. Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bernstein et al. US 4,499,299 in view of Wojcik et al., Curr. Opin. Investig. Drug, 2001, 2(8): 1112-9 (i.e. see abstract).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and provide the following comments. The Applicants respectfully assert that Bernstein et al. in view of Wojcik does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Nor would Bernstein et al. in view of Wojcik have motivated or enabled one skilled in the art to employ the subject compounds in accordance with the claimed invention. Moreover, in view of the state of the art, one skilled in the art would have been discouraged from the compounds of the claimed invention.

Bernstein et al. discloses compounds, which have activity as antagonists of slow-reacting substance of anaphylaxis, which are useful as e.g. anti-asmatic agents. In contrast, the present compounds are potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors, which are useful for treating neurological or psychiatric disorders. Wojcik merely indicates that a mGlu5 (metabotropic glutamate 5) receptor antagonist has activity as an anxiolytic (antianxiety agent) and adds nothing to Belanger et al.

As discussed above, the present claims are directed to compounds wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, which are structurally distinct from the compounds of Bernstein et al.

Applicants respectively submit that there would have been no motivation nor guidance for one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the compounds of Bernstein et al. in view of Wojcik having activity as anti-asthmatic agents and then to have modified compounds with respect to W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, to prepare the instant compounds which have activity as potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obviousness over Bernstein et al. in view of Wojick is untenable and should be withdrawn.

11. Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Nohara et al. US 4,672,073 in view of Wojcik et al. publication, Curr. Opin. Investig. Drug, 2001, 2(8): 1112-9 (i.e. see abstract).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and provide the following comments. The Applicants respectfully assert that Nohara et al. in view of Wojcik does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Nor would Nohara et al. in view of Wojcik have motivated or enabled one skilled in the art to employ the subject compounds in accordance with the claimed invention. Moreover, in view of the state of the art, one skilled in the art would have been discouraged from the compounds of the claimed invention.

Nohara et al. discloses compounds, which have activity as leukotriene antagonists, which are useful as e.g. anti-asmatic, anti-allergic or anti-inflammatory agents. In contrast, the present compounds are potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors, which are useful for treating neurological or psychiatric disorders. Wojcik merely indicates that a mGlu5 (metabotropic glutamate 5) receptor antagonist has activity as an anxiolytic (antianxiety agent) and adds nothing to Belanger et al.

As discussed above, the present claims are directed to compounds wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, which are structurally distinct from the compounds of Nohara et al.

Applicants respectively submit that there would have been no motivation nor guidance for one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the compounds of Nohara et al. in view of Wojcik having activity as leukotriene antagonists and then to have modified compounds with respect to W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, to prepare the instant compounds which have activity as potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obviousness over Nohara et al. in view of Wojick is untenable and should be withdrawn.

12. Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Belanger et al. US 4,595,540 in view of Wojcik et al. publication, Curr. Opin. Investig. Drug, 2001, 2(8): 1112-9 (i.e. see abstract).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and provide the following comments. The Applicants respectfully assert that Belanger et al. in view of Wojcik does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Nor would Belanger et al. in view of Wojcik have motivated or enabled one skilled in the art to employ the subject compounds in accordance with the claimed invention. Moreover, in view of the state of the art, one skilled in the art would have been discouraged from the compounds of the claimed invention.

Belanger et al. discloses compounds, which have activity as leukotriene antagonists, which are useful as e.g. anti-asmatic, anti-allergic or anti-inflammatory agents. In contrast, the present compounds are potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors, which are useful for treating neurological or psychiatric disorders. Wojcik merely indicates that a mGlu5 (metabotropic glutamate 5) receptor antagonist has activity as an anxiolytic (antianxiety agent) and adds nothing to Belanger et al.

As discussed above, the present claims are directed to compounds wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, which are structurally distinct from the compounds of Belanger et al.

Applicants respectively submit that there would have been no motivation nor guidance for one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the compounds of Belanger et al. in view of Wojcik having activity as leukotriene antagonists and then to have modified compounds with respect to W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, to prepare the instant compounds which have activity as potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obviousness over Belanger et al. in view of Wojick is untenable and should be withdrawn.

14. Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of Doebber et al. US 6,020,382 or over Claim 2 of Belanger et al. US 4,820,867, in view Wojcik et al. publication, Curr. Opin. Investig. Drug, 2001, 2(8): 111209 (i.e. see abstract).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and provide the following comments. The Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 of Doebber et al. or Claim 2 of Belanger et al. in view of Wojcik does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Nor would Claim 1 of Doebber et al. or Claim 2 of Belanger et al. in view of Wojcik have motivated or

enabled one skilled in the art to employ the subject compounds in accordance with the claimed invention. Moreover, in view of the state of the art, one skilled in the art would have been discouraged from the compounds of the claimed invention.

As noted above, Doebber et al. discloses compounds, which have activity for lowering or modulating triglyceride, cholesterol or high density lipoprotein levela, which are useful as e.g. antidiabetic agents. As noted above, Belanger et al. discloses compounds, which have activity as leukotriene antagonists, which are useful as e.g. anti-asmatic, anti-allergic or anti-inflammatory agents. In contrast, the present compounds are potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors, which are useful for treating neurological or psychiatric disorders. Wojcik merely indicates that a mGlu5 (metabotropic glutamate 5) receptor antagonist has activity as an anxiolytic (antianxiety agent) and adds nothing to either Claim 1 of Doebber et al. or Claim 2 of Belanger et al.

As discussed above, the present claims are directed to compounds wherein W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, which are structurally distinct from the compounds in Claim 1 of Doebber et al. or Claim 2 of Belanger et al.

Applicants respectively submit that there would have been no motivation nor guidance for one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the compounds in Claim 1 of Doebber et al. or Claim 2 of Belanger et al. in view of Wojcik having activity as antidiabetic or anti-asthma agents and then to have modified compounds with respect to W is tetrazolyl, X is -O-, Y is -O-, m is 0 (zero), and n is 4, to prepare the instant compounds which have activity as potentiators of metabotropic glutamate receptors.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 for obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of Doebber et al. or over claim 2 of Belanger et al., in view Wojcik et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

15. Claim 13 stands objected to as containing non-elected subject matter. In the interest of compact prosecution Applicants have withdrawn their traverse and cancelled the non-elected subject matter from Claim 13 (now Claim 29). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the claim is untenable and should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully contend that the application is allowable and a favorable response from the Examiner is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

J. Eric Thies
Reg. No. 35,382
Attorney for Applicant

MERCK & CO., Inc.
P.O. Box 2000
Rahway, New Jersey 07065-0907
(732) 594-3904

Date: September 21, 2007